HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 6 Wednesday, February 11, 1959 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

SPENDING: *Ike's crusade takes shape*.....(page 1)
GERMANY: *The unsung alliance*.....(page 2)
HOUSING: *"Backdoor" spending scored*.....(page 3)
RELIGION: *More clergy rebuke NCC*.....(page 4)

Crusade Against Spending: All visitors who have had interviews with the President report that Ike is firmer than ever in his war against "wild spenders." Washingtonians deemed it significant that the President chose to spend last week end with former Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey. The latter long urged economy in his counsels to the President and sparked the 1957 nation-wide wave of sentiment for a lower Budget—which unfortunately Ike did not heed. The President has not seen his former Treasury Chief for months; now they are putting their heads together.

Significant also—in the eyes of Capitol Hill—was the reason for Ike's decision to offer only a "moderate" formula for "civil rights" legislation. In a stormy session in the White House early last week, congressional leaders warned Ike that, if he wanted any success in blocking spendthrift legislation offered by the newly elected "liberal majority," he would need the votes of Southern conservatives. Ike saw the point, and hence the moderate "civil rights" proposal.

But the news which has given members of Congress most encouragement in the past week was the mouth-to-mouth report, passed to HUMAN EVENTS, that Ike has got his present Secretary of the Treasury, Robert Anderson, to take the first step in a drive to mobilize public opinion throughout the country for his economy policy. This step, HUMAN EVENTS learns, will be a meeting in Washington, February 25, of 300 to 400 of the top leaders of American business, under the chairmanship of Anderson. The Treasury chief, it is gathered, will urge the businessmen to spread the gospel of economy from Maine to California, and to activate what is regarded as a potentially strong public opinion against big spending.

In the fight against spending, Washingtonians deem it highly significant that Ike has named Vice President Nixon to head his special Cabinet Committee to fight inflation. Viewed together with Ike's "crusade" against spending, this action is being interpreted as an endorsement of Nixon for the Presidency in '60. If the young "veep" does not mishandle his opportunity, say the pros, the new post could do much to clinch the nomination for him.

Rocky Road for Taxpayers: Governor Rockefeller's proposals for a mammoth New York budget and the fearsome appearance of his tax increase have stirred not only the Empire State but also the Nation's Capital and people in the hinterland. In Washington, politicos think that the smiling Governor has got himself into no little political trouble. The picture of Rocky as a big-budget, high-tax Governor diminishes his political prestige throughout the country, and strengthens the growing element in the GOP which says: "Rockefeller will be stopped."

The effect of the Governor's bid for higher taxes has been highly explosive on the sidewalks of New York, and has inspired remarks like the following from average citizens: "Rockefeller fooled the voters by campaigning with hot dogs. He couldn't be elected dog catcher now." The repercussions of his proposal to increase the state budget (by about 15 per cent over the last budget of his predecessor, Governor Harriman) appear all over the country. Harriman had increased New York State spending from $1.2 billion in 1955 to $1.8 billion in 1958. Now Rockefeller presents a budget of $2.041 billion—$241 million more than the ultra-New Deal Harriman.

Even Democrats are amazed, and Democratic state boss Mike Prendergast (look who's talking!) remarked: "Spend and spend and elect and elect." During the last fall campaign Harriman had warned of what could happen when he called his opponent "High Spend Rockefeller." The course Rockefeller is following is naturally considered a blueprint of his policy if he should be elected President.

At a time when President Eisenhower urges a balanced Budget with no increase in taxes, Rockefeller's directly contrary course produces a chilly reaction among those Republicans who last fall looked upon Nelson as Presidential timber. (Recalled is Ike's emphatic remark, at the National Press Club last month, that he could not back a GOP candidate who did not share his own views about the limitations that should be clamped on Big Government.) And last week's Gallup poll shows that 72 per cent of American voters favor cutting back Government expenditures instead of upping taxes. If this be an accurate index, the man in Albany has chosen an unpopular policy.

Those observers who cautioned on the morrow of the victory, "Let's wait and see what he does in Albany," appear to be right. "Government by grin and spending" may prove an inadequate leverage for election in 1960.

Melee Over Missiles: Is the hullabaloo over missile production all politics? Not all—but the criticism of the Administration by the "liberal" Democrats is mostly just politics. On Capitol Hill, Republicans can very convincingly ask: if the Democrats are sincerely apprehensive over our missile production and, as they claim, need more money, why do they not cut welfare spending appropriations (now being pushed by their leader, Lyndon Johnson) and apply the money to the missile budget?

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who carries the basic responsibility for our not having moved faster on missiles? If the public does not know, all production experts do know the US failed to start work on new weapons ten years ago, when the dominating clique of scientists (typified by Dr. Oppenheimer) did not want to work on weapons. This "pacifist" tendency sprang in some instances from fellow-traveller sentiment (the target of the new weapons would be "Holy" Soviet Russia); in other cases, from a guilt complex for having produced the ultimate weapon, the atom bomb; in still others, from political naiveté based on an expectation that Soviet Russia would prove reasonable and agree to nuclear disarmament. Hence, many scientists preferred to work on civilian uses of the atom. In any case, the genius of American science and technology turned to "peaceful" research and development instead of to weapons, while the Soviets were planning their strategy in terms, not of "peace," but of war. Those were the early days when the Truman Administration failed to see the true picture and act.

What role did Budget-cutting and economy play in failure to speed up missile production? Little or none at all. The "economy" argument comes from New Dealers who want as much spending as possible, regardless of the inflationary consequences. Wernher von Braun and other missile experts a year ago exploded the idea that lack of money was a principal factor in the slowness of the American effort (see HUMAN EVENTS *for November 16, 1957).*

Why hasn't the Pentagon stepped on the gas in the past 15 months? It has made gains, but failed to push the work more rapidly because the Administration failed to set up another "Manhattan Project" (the speedy program which produced the atom bomb during World War II). Such a crash program was urged by Senator Styles Bridges (R.-N.H.) in a specially written article appearing in HUMAN EVENTS for October 19, 1957. David S. Teeple, atomic energy specialist and writer on these subjects, pleaded, a year and a half ago, for the creation of a crash project.

Is there any danger in our present pace and schedule of ICBM production? Probably not—because of our great retaliatory power through the Strategic Air Command. But, observers remark, that "probably not" rests on the US belief that Soviet Russia has not or will not have in the early future any new weapons or systems which could effectively ward off or greatly diminish the impact of a SAC attack. Undoubtedly, Russian scientists have been working hard to remove what is recognized as Russia's Achilles heel. But Russian science and production operate under rigid secrecy (while ours do not) and we cannot know. Therefore, it is said, a crash program should be initiated to insure maximum efficient production within our own missile project.

Along Diplomatic Row: As the Soviet war of nerves steps up in the Berlin corridor, foreign emissaries in Washington's diplomatic quarter lift their hands in surprise at what they dub the "near blackout" of news and comment, in the American press, on a historic development across the Atlantic. These diplomats find it difficult to understand why America, which twice went to war in Europe because of the age-old conflict of Germany and France, now virtually ignores the new rapprochement between the Fifth French Republic, under General de Gaulle, and the West German Republic, under Chancellor Adenauer—in the face of Soviet threats of aggression on Berlin.

Nothing comparable to this development, says diplomatic row, has taken place since the famous Locarno Conference in 1925, when France and Germany sought to patch up differences after the wounds of the First World War. In fact, it is pointed out, this new rapprochement is all the more striking, because Locarno took place between "liberal" and internationalist statesmen (Briand and Stresemann), whereas today's reconciliation involves French nationalism, in the person of de Gaulle. Indeed, it is France today—in contrast to her hesitant attitude 30-odd years ago—which seems to spur on the rapprochement, urging that no compromise interrupt the lines of communication between Berlin and the West. General de Gaulle, it is also noted, has chosen to visit only one foreign statesman since his recent elevation to the Presidency—and that statesman is Adenauer.

Yet, the American press—so remark these diplomats—devotes reams of speculation to whether the new Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Fulbright, will pressure Secretary Dulles to compromise on the Berlin situation. The papers here devote little space to the firm attitude of Bonn and Paris, instead stressing the power of a favored Senator who strikes an appeasement note.

In his foreign policy, Chairman Fulbright is referred to by informed quarters on Capitol Hill as "that Rhodes Scholar fellow." It may or may not be true—but in the eyes of those who watch foreign affairs in Congress, Fulbright is thought to be influenced by the views of the British Foreign Office. Just now, for internal political reasons (the Conservative Macmillan Government wants no war scare before the impending general election), the British Foreign Office tends to favor some appeasement of Soviet Russia.

With the word that Macmillan would travel to Moscow soon for an audience with Khrushchev, diplomatic row has dubbed the Prime Minister "the Neville Chamberlain of the missile age"—in recollection of the Briton who, in 1938, trekked into Germany to confer with Hitler.

● While Fulbright looks to London, Hubert Humphrey, a colleague on the Foreign Relations Committee, looks to Moscow, scene of his recent publicity success. Humphrey, as a matter of fact, echoes the Moscow line when he declaims that West Germany is itself a war menace, because of the German role in World Wars I and II. Humphrey fails to mention that the Germans have at the most six divisions (compared with the 212 Soviet divisions) and neither an air force nor a nuclear establishment.

Yet neither Fulbright, Humphrey nor any other Senator chooses to dwell on the startling formation of a Franco-German front—of a France which is a military power being linked with a West Germany which is an industrial power, and which has a high potential in military capability. France—long the "sick man of Europe"—has staged a remarkable comeback under de Gaulle and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has cast in its lot with its ancient enemy across the Rhine. This—remarks diplomatic row—should provide great encouragement for Secretary Dulles in his diplomatic endeavors, and for the anxious American people, who, inadequately informed of the true situation, watch the unfolding European scene.

Housing Bill: Democratic leader Lyndon Johnson has thrown down his first gage of defiance to Ike's demand for a balanced Budget, in the big-spending housing bill, S. 57. This gigantic piece of "giveaway" legislation contains provisions for "urban renewal," "slum clearance" and a host of other boondoggling features—to the tune of almost $3 billion.

While the statism and extravagance of the measure draw the ire of conservative legislators, other less apparent features have also come in for heavy criticism. First among these is the bill's bid to set up a system of "backdoor" financing, whereby the housing and "urban renewal" programs would be paid for by direct "fiat" financing from the Treasury, rather than through appropriations openly screened and debated by Congress. The bill includes a "sleeper" provision which would allow direct lending for school construction.

In the House, where the bill now goes for consideration, "Judge" Howard Smith (D.-Va.), powerful chairman of the Rules Committee, has declared that he will do everything in his power to halt this circumvention of Congress' power of the purse.

HUMAN EVENTS rang the alarm bell on just such a tricky attempt to skirt Congress in its issue of August 4, 1958—when last session's housing bill was up for consideration. This was the point which, by consolidating conservative opposition, defeated that multibillion-dollar housing measure.

● One other aspect of the housing fight draws indignant comment: Democratic Leader Lyndon Johnson's ramming the Sparkman bill through the Senate (with 1000 pages of hearing, report and text to read) before that chamber had sufficient opportunity to deliberate on its merits. This is the typical Johnson technique —attempting to settle the fate of important legislation by cloakroom maneuvering, and stifling the Senate in its attempt to ventilate legislative issues.

Education Front: Commentary among the leftist press fraternity seeks to suggest that the "liberal" complexion of the current Congress expresses a popular mandate for big spending. In this expectation the left-wing is working fervently to promote a bonanza Federal school-construction bill—one out in the open, in contrast to the "sleeper" provision of the housing bill.

But reports from the grass roots suggest that popular sentiment is in fact running sharply to less spending, rather than more. Here, for instance, are sample findings from a recent *Wall Street Journal* survey on local school construction:

"Irate citizens of Watertown, S. D., turned thumbs down on a $1.9 million bond issue for a high school three times in recent years. Now the school board, in a new effort to get the issue approved, is considering giving voters a choice of eliminating a gymnasium and thereby cutting the cost to about $1.5 million. Liberal, Kan., school trustees cut costs by having a new building constructed without hallways; each classroom has an outside door."

New House Leadership: Conservatives are firmly in the saddle in the GOP in the House, and Modern Republicanism in that branch of the Congress is dead. That's the conclusion of Capital analysts surveying the new GOP appointments to key House committees. Here's the way the new appointees line up, according to the voting breakdown issued last fall by the far-left Americans for Democratic Action:

● Chairman of the GOP Policy Committee in the House is Representative John Byrnes of Wisconsin. On the ADA scoresheet for last session, his rating was 93 per cent anti-ADA.

● *On the Rules Committee, Congressmen Carroll Reece (Tenn.) and Hamer Budge (Idaho) assume posts vacated by Hugh Scott and Henry Latham. Reece's ADA rating was 91 per cent anti-ADA, Budge's 100 per cent.*

● On Ways and Means, four new conservatives have been appointed. They are Bruce Alger of Texas (100 per cent), Jackson Betts of Ohio (100 per cent), Victor Knox of Michigan (75 per cent), and James Utt of California (100 per cent).

● *New GOP appointments to the Appropriations Committee, the third of the key committees in the House, reflect the same conservative tendency. Those new appointees who served in the last session, with their anti-ADA ratings, are as follows: John Rhodes (Arizona) 78 per cent; John Pillion (New York) 83 per cent; Phil Weaver (Nebraska) 83 per cent; William Minshall (Ohio) 83 per cent; Keith Thomson (Wyoming) 93 per cent; Robert Michel (Illinois) 67 per cent.*

Labor Front: A representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation—America's largest and most powerful farm organization—last week lowered the boom on labor boss abuses and Senator John Kennedy's "sweetheart" labor bill, now up for renewed consideration. Matt Triggs, Farm Bureau legislative representative, told the Senate Labor Committee that Kennedy's bill (S. 505) was a weak-tea affair, dealing with symptoms, not causes. Moreover, Triggs pointed up a bit of subterfuge in the bill which actually takes rights away from a worker, rather than protecting them.

"Section 302 of the bill," he pointed out, "provides that a union member who alleges a violation . . . with respect to union elections, and who has exhausted his intra-union remedies, may appeal to the Secretary of Labor, who may investigate the situation and may institute appropriate legal action. Section 303 provides that this shall be an exclusive remedy."

By the provision making the Secretary the "exclusive" court of appeal, Triggs pointed out, "the aggrieved person is denied his right of judicial remedy [through the courts] unless the Secretary of Labor decides to proceed with the case . . . The bill would take away from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

individual union member a right which he now has. This goes in the direction of government by men, rather than by law."

Triggs added that "if this provision had been enacted into law two years ago, the petition of certain Teamster Union members for judicial relief . . . could not have been accepted or acted upon by the court."

● *Memo to AFL-CIO Vice President Walter Reuther, vocal advocate of integration*: columnist Don Maclean of the Washington *Daily News* reports that "the American Federation of Musicians here is segregated into two locals—No. 161 for white musicians and No. 710 for colored musicians. Each has a salaried president, vice president, treasurer, secretary, and business agent. The locals compete, sometimes take playing jobs away from each other."

Clergy: *Christianity Today*, a fortnightly religious journal edited by some of the country's foremost Protestant laymen and ministers (address: 1014 Washington Building, Washington 5), last week summed up the furor within Protestant ranks over the National Council of Churches' advocacy of diplomatic recognition for Red China (see HUMAN EVENTS for December 1 and 22, 1958). In an editorial entitled, "Why is NCC Prestige Sagging?" the magazine summarizes the broad range of protest generated by the NCC action, some of which was chronicled in previous issues of HUMAN EVENTS.

Christianity Today notes that the action drew the fire of Secretary of State Dulles, himself an "elder statesman" of NCC doings, as well as the censure of numerous religious groups. Among the instances cited by the editorial:

"The Jesuit weekly *America* scored 'disregard of the anti-religious aspect of communism. . . . '

"Dr. Herbert S. Mekeel, speaking for the National Association of Evangelicals, and Dr. Carl McIntire, for the American Council of Churches, issued sharp reproofs, and in Formosa, Chinese pastors of 57 Protestant churches and organizations deplored NCC's 'terribly misguided judgment. . . . '

"Dr. Daniel A. Poling, of *Christian Herald*, said: 'With every influence I have, I repudiate it,' and Dr. Carl F. H. Henry, of *Christianity Today*, told the Washington *Post* that the Cleveland conference 'would have put ahead the Christian cause had it prayed for the conversion of the Communist leaders. . . . '

"Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, one of the NCC's radio voices, declared himself 'completely opposed.' Christianity Today's **poll of ministers and lay leaders ran eight-to-one against the Cleveland action while the Committee of One Million tally [see HUMAN EVENTS for January 21, 1959] . . . ran seven-to-one against."**

Presidential Poll: The present strength of Vice President Nixon among regular Republicans was reflected last week in a poll conducted by the Washington research organization, *Congressional Quarterly*. The CQ poll showed Nixon in front of Rockefeller by a margin of roughly 4½ to 1, while a lone vote introduced the name of yet a third contender for the Presidential nomination, Senator Styles Bridges of New Hampshire. (The appearance of Bridges' name coincides with a stirring of sentiment to see the Hill's most powerful Republican, now 60, in the next race for the Presidency.)

Fulton Lewis: A libel judgment of $145,000 was awarded by a D. C. jury last week to Mrs. Pearl Wanamaker, in her suit against broadcaster Fulton Lewis, Jr. She was the Washington state Superintendent of Public Instruction and the finalist on the subject of Federal aid to education in the 1955 White House Conference on Education. This trial outcome followed similar verdicts to Mrs. Wanamaker of $10,000 in Walla Walla, Washington and $7500 in Oklahoma City. All three judgments are being appealed. Mrs. Wanamaker had filed suits against Lewis in the states of Washington, Colorado, Iowa, Nebraska, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York and the District of Columbia.

On January 6, 1956 Lewis erroneously identified Mrs. Wanamaker as having a brother who had defected behind the Iron Curtain. Lewis confused her name with that of a Washington state school teacher who had such a brother. (Mrs. Wanamaker had reinstated the school teacher after the latter was fired by the County Superintendent for taking the Fifth Amendment when asked about her Communist connections.)

When Lewis discovered his mistake he instantly wired the newspapers in the state of Washington that he would retract the part of his broadcast which confused the identities, and he made a 15-minute apology in his next broadcast.

The jury held that there was no malice on Lewis' part and awarded no punitive damages, but the size of the compensatory damages has staggered authorities in the publication and broadcasting fields who watch the results of libel actions.

CLERGYMEN PRAISE HUMAN EVENTS

C. E. SHEPHERD, Minister, First Christian Church, Carrollton, Ga.: "I certainly appreciate the fine analysis and statements of fact. I find it very helpful both in preaching and counseling."

CLARK O. BROWN, Pastor, Plainwell Assembly of God, Plainwell, Mich.: "HUMAN EVENTS presents a side of the picture that we need to know to appraise the news properly. It is appreciated."

W. DIXON, Pastor, First Baptist Church, Greggton, Tex.: "HUMAN EVENTS gives voice to my convictions with amazing consistency. Truth needs a voice. May God give you courage and wisdom and insight to continue your strategic role."

REV. RUSSELL HAWK, Bethel Evangelical United Brethren, Fostoria, Ohio: "HUMAN EVENTS is the best source of factual information I have ever read."

H. E. BASSETT, Pastor, Free Methodist Church, Clinton, Mass.: "You are providing a wonderful service. HUMAN EVENTS is a fine, frank, informative paper. It fills a need no other source seems to notice."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, and 1957 volumes available.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
M. STANTON EVANS, *Managing Editor*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 6 HUMAN EVENTS February 11, 1959

Article Section II

'McCarthyism' Revisited

Survey Discredits 'Academic Freedom' Plaints

LIBRARY STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

By RICHARD WHALEN

IN 1954, Robert Hutchins, president of the Fund for the Republic, angrily asserted that "the spirit of the academic profession" was being crushed by "McCarthyism." Scores of left-wing vigilantes echoed the charge that the late Senator, like a killer shark, had knifed through the academic domain, terrifying the poor professors.

It is ironic, then, that Mr. Hutchins' own hired hands should prove him wrong. A Fund grant to the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University has produced The Academic Mind, *by Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr., which reveals that, for many professors, the Terror came and went, leaving scarcely a ripple. More important, this self-portrait of the American social scientist suggests that "the difficult years" were most trying for the few professors who refused to conform to the ideas of Mr. Hutchins and his kind.*

During the spring of 1955, more than 2,400 historians, economists, sociologists, anthropologists and political scientists, at 165 colleges and universities, were questioned at length about the state of "academic freedom." They were asked point-blank: "In the past few years, have you felt that your own academic freedom has been threatened in any way, or not?" Amazingly, 1,920 scholars confessed that they had not felt threatened (p. 378).

Of course, many professors were *apprehensive*, especially when prodded with such questions as: "Have you ever thought about the possibility that the administration of the college has a political file or dossier on every faculty member, including yourself? (p. 76)." Generally, however, the academicians felt secure in their ivy-covered citadels. Only 52 per cent of them were at all concerned with the new public interest in what they taught (p. 36). Oddly enough, the more *apprehensive* the professor, the more *permissive* (indulgent of leftist beliefs and activities) he was likely to be (pp. 95-99).

This apparent paradox—worried professors baring their breasts and shouting defiance—is explained by the prevailing code of the academic community. The mood of most campuses is decidedly "liberal," *The Academic Mind* establishes, and the social scientists form the vanguard of "liberalism." Hence, the apprehensive professor, roundly damning Senator McCarthy and vilifying conservatism, is merely burning incense before household gods. As Lazarsfeld and Thielens observe candidly: "What at times appears dangerous to the larger community is proper in the eyes of one's peers, and they are the ones who matter more (p. 105)."

THE TIGHTLY KNIT social science fraternity depicted in *The Academic Mind* resembles a primitive village, where the elders have erected, and command worship of, collectivist totems. Economic and political individualism, traditional religion and nationalism are frowned upon, if not flatly declared to be taboo. Shrewd youngsters soon learn to please their elders—the givers of tenure and promotions—by lisping the accepted "liberal" incantations. "While outside forces such as legislative committees may have harsh and definite means to do him damage," *The Academic Mind* says of the professor, "he cannot underestimate the subtle deprivations to which his immediate professional environment could subject him (p. 105)." Plainly, the scholar who "deviates" from the "group norm," to use the tribal jargon, may expect to be isolated, perhaps intimidated and almost certainly neglected at promotion time.

Lazarsfeld and Thielens are not upset by the plight of "deviants"; their concern is for the "liberal" majority, the conformists. Indeed, so powerful is the *mystique* of academic "liberalism" that the gentlemen from Columbia feel compelled to explain to their peers why a handful of right-wing professors uncovered in the survey are not tarred and feathered; half-apologetically, they remark: "Words like reac-

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tionary and fascist will not be found in our report (p. 121)." Such generosity isn't shared by the eminent David Riesman, professor of sociology at Harvard, who wrote the closing chapter of the book. Striking a blow for the tribal notion of free thought, Riesman describes several erring professors (who disagree with him) as "reactionaries (p. 302)."

Further insight into the academic community's mores is offered in an illuminating review of *The Academic Mind* by another Columbia sociologist, Seymour M. Lipset. Lipset, who identifies himself as "a professor who always has voted Democratic or Socialist" (except when supporting Senator Jacob Javits), writes in the Columbia University *Forum*: "The liberal consensus within the social sciences . . . actually serves to intimidate conservatives and those professors who agree with the outside critics of academic liberalism much more than outside prying and criticism inhibit those left-of-center."

With this cozy consensus in mind, it is easy to understand why 38 per cent of those professors interviewed would approve the formation of a Young Communist League on their campus (p. 114). It is also unremarkable that only 14 per cent of the scholars saw domestic communism as a "great danger" to American freedom.

These permissive defenders of nonconformity might have reacted differently in, say, 1935, had a band of undergraduates formed a Young Fascist League; and how many social scientists were then unconcerned with Hitler's threat to free institutions? But these are idle questions; the fact remains that, by and large, the social scientists reserve their wrath for the right.

From the evidence assembled by the ferrets of the Fund, it is easy to believe that academic conservatives were "rarely endangered" in the early 'fifties. The authors of *The Academic Mind* note dispassionately: "There were altogether perhaps five instances in which simple 'conservatism,' uncomplicated by overtones of bigotry or authoritarianism, led to unfortunate consequences for a teacher." How soft, in contrast to the cries of "witchhunt," is that phrase, "unfortunate consequences"; how casually the blanket of "bigotry" and "authoritarianism" is tossed over all cases other than the selected few; and how calmly the guardians of academic freedom conclude that "the conservative wing of American college teachers have rarely found themselves endangered in recent years (p. 60-61)."

UNFORTUNATELY, the soothing conclusions of the Columbia sociologists were virtually predetermined by their questionnaire. While Lazarsfeld and Thielens avoid defining academic freedom, which is what the survey is ostensibly about, they clearly label the enemy: The non-academic outsider, the snooper. With all the authoritarians outside the academic compound, by definition, it isn't surprising that *The Academic Mind* fails to establish the degree of freedom of speech and opinion enjoyed by nonconformists within the academic community.

As they probe and sneer at the largely ineffective off-campus criticism of militantly left-wing professors, Lazarsfeld and Thielens ignore the effective pressure exerted by the "liberal" majority on the campus. Academic freedom, they conclude, is threatened from outside. They do not ask whether it has been suppressed inside the academy itself. The bitter experiences of such conservative scholars as Alexander St. Ivanyi, Felix Wittmer, Kenneth Colegrove, A. H. Hobbs and others testify that, on many college faculties, freedom of belief means freedom to accept what the majority believes, or else.

The religious sociologist, the patriotic political scientist, the conservative economist—these are the men who must live and work within the monolithic conformity of "liberalism" that passes for academic freedom. For these true nonconformists, each year is "difficult," because they refuse to bow to the communal totems and must stand alone.

Richard Whalen became a regular reader of HUMAN EVENTS while in college. His article, "The Battle of Queens College: How the Robert A. Taft Club Outfought the Left-Wingers," published October 6, 1956 in HUMAN EVENTS, won him a chance to start as a reporter with the Richmond (Va.) *News Leader*, one of the South's greatest newspapers. Though not yet 24 years of age, Whalen has just been appointed Associate Editor, second in command on the editorial side of the *News Leader*.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "'McCARTHYISM' REVISITED" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 6 HUMAN EVENTS February 11, 1959

Article Section I

Out of the Millions, Into the Billions

Our Agriculture Mess and What You Pay for It

by FARM ANALYST

TAKING FROM THE many for the benefit of the few and convincing the many that they are the real beneficiaries is an ancient practice now being put into new bottles. Let's take a look-see as to how this formula works in our agricultural complex. Let's discover, if we can, how we have gone from millions to billions in this field.

At the conclusion of World War II, the six "basic commodities" (wheat, corn, cotton, rice, tobacco and peanuts) were operating under Federal legislation that generally guaranteed them support at 90 per cent of parity—parity being that brain-twisting formula by which the relationship of a farmer's costs and his income, in terms of relative purchasing power, is determined. Thrown in for good measure was the Steagal Amendment, which extended supports under varying conditions to practically everything from pickles to pecans.

All this was to end two years after the cessation of hostilities. Fair enough—but it didn't, or at least the big money part of it didn't. It has gone on and on and on with ramifications to dizzy a self-respecting electronic brain. Controls that don't control; acreage allotments; marketing quotas, mostly vitiated by interposition of Congress (this is a case in which interposition has really worked). For example, when our wheat surplus had reached staggering figures, under the law the Secretary of Agriculture was to cut the amount of wheat that could be planted to approximately 19 million acres. This was murder, politically. When the smoke had settled, the Secretary had been forbidden to cut wheat planting below 55 million acres.

It has gone that way with practically every effort to reach sanity in our farm program. As long as corn and wheat votes can be traded for tobacco, cotton and peanut votes, the boys have got it made.

Approximately 60 per cent of our farm marketings are not under price support. The gruesome ghost that has run the Department of Agriculture's budget from a few hundred millions (spent largely for research and education) to over $7 billion for fiscal 1959, and possibly over $10 billion in fiscal 1961, is a legal, but unhappy, transfer of taxes paid by the many into the hands of the few.

Of the approximately 4.7 million farm and ranch families in the Nation, less than two million produce 85 per cent of the food and fiber which go into commercial channels; it is these two million, who need assistance least (because they are efficient, low cost producers), who received the biggest share of this largesse.

To pile indignity on insult, it is the biggest of the big—the "400" of agricultural society, so to speak—who really get their talons on the exciting money. To tick off a few examples, our storage costs for agricultural surpluses, only a small part of which we can sell for soft currencies under Public Law 480, or give away, are rapidly approaching $1 billion a year. Whom do you think gets the bulk of these storage fees? The farmer? Let's not be silly!

As for "non-recourse loans," the merry euphemism bureaucrats use to describe the heads-or-tails-you-can't-lose game, here are some figures grabbed at random from a USDA report issued on March 5, 1954. This shows that the average of the five largest loans to cotton growers in Mississippi in 1953 was $479,535, while the average for all the cotton growers in the state was $372. Obviously, from these figures, there were plenty of unfortunate farmers who received $10 or $15 apiece, and paid more in indirect taxes on the pitifully few things they could buy than they received in support payments.

LATEST GROTESQUERIE appears on Page A-8347, *et seq.*, in the *Congressional Record* for September 12, 1958. There is given a long list of farmers and farm corporations who received from $10,000 to $322,000 of Federal money for taking land out of production. The first part of this list, as given in the *Congressional Record*, is photographically reproduced on page 2 of this article. (Parenthetically, even with this program going, we still produced fantastic surpluses; when these acres come back into production during the next crop year, take to the hills, boys, the dam's bust.)

A few further statistics on this operation, and you've had it. In the $10,000 to $322,000 class there were 2,422 who received a total of $43,855,793 for taking 1,597,661 acres out of production. Altogether 1.26 million ladies and gents received almost $614 million for doing what the free enterprise system would have compelled them to do long ago at no public expense—to stop growing unwanted commodities on more than 21 million acres of land. Finally, the number of payees receiving $10,000 or more was only one-fifth of one per cent of the number of all payees, but they received 7.1 per cent of the money and took out of production 7.5 per cent of the acres.

Truly, in our nonsense farm set-up we have gone from millions to billions, we have taken from the many and given to the few. Think this over when you confront Form 1040—and when you go to the polls.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Where Farm Support Money Is Going

(Photographically reproduced from the *Congressional Record*)

Payees receiving 1957 Soil Bank acreage reserve compensation in excess of $10,000, May 12, 1958

Name and address	Compensation	Reserve acres
John W. Baughman Farms Co., Liberal, Kans.	$322,012.89	127,239.6
Garvey Farms, Colby, Kans	278,187.38	22,779.9
Harris Ranches, Sahaurita, Ariz	209,701.80	1,666.0
Ray Flanagan, Red Top, Calif	138,122.20	1,629.2
Ranch Tierra Prieta, Eloy, Ariz	135,107.45	931.
Sutter Basin Corp., Ltd., Robbins, Calif.	128,442.88	1,99
Westlake Farms, Stratford, Calif	125,942.50	1,
Robert Pelletier, Bakersfield, Calif	124,378.80	7
J. H. Williams, Natchitoches, La	120,088.50	1,68
Crews Farm, Pecos, Tex	107,200.00	800.
Vista Del Llano Farms, Firebaugh, Calif.	103,411.02	1,986.
Jackson & Reinert, Paso Robles, Calif	97,209.00	3,08
Estrella Land & Cattle Co., Glendale, Ariz.	96,706.50	586
Hammonds Ranch, Inc., Firebaugh, Calif.	95,535.64	928.
Moser Ranch, DeKalb, Tex	87,094.32	905.
Duncan Brothers, Alvin, Tex	85,953.11	1,099.
Sherrell and La Follette, Phoenix, Ariz	84,103.40	532.
Newhall Land & Farming Co., Firebaugh, Calif.	83,903.50	870.5
S. A. Camp Farms Co., Rupert, Idaho	81,197.52	1,471.5
Sunset Ranches Inc., Chandler, Ariz	79,155.50	545.9
McCarthy & Hilderbrand Farms, Inc., Eloy, Ariz.	78,948.50	723.8
George E. Gano estate, Harold Nelson Hobart, Jr., executor, Hutchinson, Kans.	78,476.96	4,333
Porter & Wentz, Brownsville, Tex	75,576.37	3,199.0
Farmers Investment Co., Eloy, Ariz	74,573.50	514.3
American Christian Institute, Phoenix, Ariz	73,088.40	553.7
Mississippi State Penitentiary, Parchman, Miss	71,000.00	1,000
Eddie J. Carpenter and Patricio Brijalba, Pecos, Tex	70,500.60	443.
J. Ernest Bertrand, Oakley, Kans	70,337.70	3,914.
Martin Hereford, Inc., Madras, Oreg	69,757.16	2,486.0
Stanley & McDaniel, Phoenix, Ariz	69,300.00	420.
O. L. Garmon, Jr., Mark, Miss	67,097.40	763
George B. Franklin & Son, Holly Ridge, La.	67,040.33	957
Raymond Thomas, Inc., Five Points, Calif.	66,839.50	395
Glen H. Shay, Eloy, Ariz	66,549.60	421.2
The Garin Co., Firebaugh, Calif	66,460.92	625.
Chui Chiuschu Ranches, Inc., Casa Grande, Ariz.	65,465.40	367.
Progresso Farms, Pecos, Tex	65,408.00	448.0
Lee Wilson & Co., Wilson, Ark	64,851.10	820.
Floyd N. Smith Co., Phoenix, Ariz	64,350.00	390
J. T. Fargason & Son, Lyon, Miss	63,960.00	730
Peres, Nickel & Pfitzer, Los Banos, Calif.	62,998.80	792
Paul M. Brophy, Casa Grande, Ariz	62,104.80	466.
Winters Farm, Pecos, Tex	61,833.60	361.6
Waddell Ranch Co., Waddell, Ariz	60,885.00	369.0
Broadview Farms, Firebaugh, Calif	60,681.00	537.0
Flader Land Co., Denver, Colo	60,068.13	3,017.
Dan Seligman, Shaw, Miss	59,992.80	806
J. L. Hodges, Buckeye, Ariz	59,925.00	399
Chandler Co., Fort Stockton, Tex	59,783.60	405
Rio Grande Care, McAllen, Tex	59,642.52	1,33
Clark & Roberts, Pecos, Tex	57,533.70	3
Bing K. Wong, Marana, Ariz	56,700.00	4
Bi-County Farms, Prosser, Wash	56,519.64	2,61
Delmar Durrett, Amarillo, Tex	55,974.61	4,482.
Allen & Ritch, Lyon, Miss	55,354.40	528.4
William E. Glotz, Tranquillity, Calif	55,073.20	480.9
Thomas L. Moran, Dumas, Tex	54,655.83	5,146.
Heidrick Brothers, Woodland, Calif	54,528.08	972.5
Layton Knaggs, Woodland, Calif	54,388.47	788.2
Warren N. Moore, Alvin, Tex	53,580.40	923
Bentley Johnston, DeKalb, Tex	53,100.00	
W. J. Asmussen, Agar, S. Dak	52,807.57	
B. F. Younger, Sr., Buckeye, Ariz	52,503.00	
Redfern Ranches, Dos Palos, Calif	51	
Dale Steele Ford, Kans		

Name and address	Compensation	Reserve acres
Clifford C. Hart, Holly, Colo	$43,780.69	2
J. Earle Porter Estate, Caldwell, Tex	43,668.00	0
Blackland Farms, Eloy, Ariz	43,650.00	30
Fazal & Namet, Butte City, Calif	43,204.20	55
Dalglish Farms, Inc., Phoenix, Ariz	43,124.40	326
Otis R. Duty, Lemoore, Calif	42,835.46	406.
Sam Judd, Las Animas, Colo	42,239.88	3,476.
R. T. Hoover, El Paso, Tex	41,762.50	334.
F. F. Bradley, Pecos, Tex	41,724.00	244.0
J. B. Bull, Amado, Ariz	41,700.00	300.
Woodland Farms, Inc., Woodland, Calif.	41,622.88	603.5
Vernon L. Thomas, Inc., Huron, Calif	41,489.50	245
W. D. Rorick & Son, Johnson, Kans	41,205.92	1,92
Woolfolk Farms, Tunica, Miss	40,500.00	56
Empire Farms, Eloy, Ariz	40,498.50	279
Lorwood Plantation, Parma, Mo	40,399.80	642
J. A. Roberts, Casa Grande, Ariz	40,260.00	305
Norfleet & Allen, Dundee, Miss	40,255.00	415.
Campbell Farming Corp., Hardin, Mont.	40,227.10	1,942.
Diablo Farms, Pahrump, Nev	40,060.02	600.
John and Alex Kochergen, Fresno, Calif.	39,974.00	253
Earl Weisenberger, Scott City, Kans	39,961.47	4,129
Broyles Pecos Co., Fort Stockton, Tex	39,653.60	27
Baca Float Ranch, Nogales, Ariz	39,325.00	63
E. R. Clark & Sons, Nogales, Ariz	39,325.00	65
L. R. Allison, Tornillo, Tex	39,305.30	28
Brock Ranches, El Centro, Calif	39,184.10	28
Carl A. Nicholas, Dexter, N. Mex	39,082.50	289.
Curtis C. James, Burlington, Colo	38,994.67	2,142.4
Brazos Varisco, Bryan, Tex	38,976.00	609.0
J. E. Crain, Wilson, Ark	38,846.10	417
Robert G. Smith, Harlingen, Tex	38,712.30	1,13
George G. Chance, Bryan, Tex	38,384.20	61
Russell Cherry, Raymondville, Tex	38,320.50	1,191
E. B. Belshe, Round Pond, Ark	38,212.80	502
H. L. Holland, Coolidge, Ariz	38,065.76	274
Cecil W. Schwerdfeger, Syracuse, Kans	38,024.21	2,554.
Clardy Farms, Roswell, N. Mex	37,601.10	305.
R. R. Rhymes, Rayville, La	37,505.00	577
Owsley Hill, Los Fresnos, Tex	37,364.82	62
Paul E. Plummer & Sons, Johnson, Kans.	37,324.76	1,743
W. P. Mattox, Pecos, Tex	37,052.00	252
Pennington & Lambert, Raymondville, Tex.	37,048.80	430
Valley View Farms, Phoenix, Ariz	36,900.00	23
H. S. Blakemore, Colorado Springs, Colo.	36,795.06	2
J. T. Babb, Edna, Tex	36,649.10	
Schorzman Bros., Quincy, Wash	36,539.70	
R. R. Rutherford, Springfield, Colo	36,506.30	
Horrigan Farms, Prosser, Wash	36,48	
J. Willhite & Son, Holly, Colo	36	
R. N. Hopson, Clarksdale, Miss		
R. D. Wilmans & Sons, Inc., Dio		

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "OUT OF THE MILLIONS, INTO THE BILLIONS" at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED